

Advisory Committee – Warrant Article Questionnaire - Instructions
2022

Thanks for submitting a warrant article to Town Meeting. The Advisory Committee (the “AC”) assigns all articles to a subcommittee, which holds a public hearing that you should plan on attending. The subcommittee chair or a designee will work with you to set a mutually convenient date, within the confines of the time the subcommittee has available.

You do not need to make a formal presentation to the subcommittee, but it would be extremely helpful if you would complete the questionnaire below, answering only the questions that are relevant to your article. Please note that completing this questionnaire is discretionary. There is nothing to compel a sponsor under Massachusetts General Laws or the Town Bylaws for anything that is being requested.

Please enter your responses on this form¹ and email it at least three days in advance of the subcommittee hearing to the subcommittee chair and to lpotscher@brooklinema.gov. Providing your responses in advance will make the subcommittee hearing more efficient and quite possibly more satisfactory to all parties. (You may be asked for more detail at the hearing.)

After its hearing, the subcommittee will prepare a report for the AC, and you will be invited to attend a meeting of the Committee. The AC may decide to accept the subcommittee’s report without debate. In that case, the subcommittee’s report will be included in the Combined Reports, a document that is published in advance of Town Meeting and distributed to all Town Meeting Members. Alternatively, the AC may have a full discussion and debate, and then vote on a recommendation.

If that happens, you will be able to respond to questions and make a brief statement just before the full AC votes.

Note that the AC provides only recommendations to Town Meeting, and Town Meeting is not required to accept those recommendations. In addition, you will have an opportunity at Town Meeting to present your case for passing the warrant article.

We strongly recommended that you consult with Town Counsel or the Town Meeting Moderator to ensure that the article you submitted is in proper form, especially if it involves amending the Town’s General Bylaws or Zoning Bylaws. And if it involves Zoning, be sure to consult with the Community Planning & Development Department. Contact information for all parties is available on the Town’s website.

See pages 3-4 of the [Town Meeting Handbook](#), which explains how Town Meeting addresses warrant articles.

Thank you again for engaging in the civic life of the community.

¹ This is a fillable PDF, so you don’t need Word or one of its alternatives, For tech support with the form, contact msandman@brooklinema.gov.

Advisory Committee – Warrant Article Questionnaire
2022

Today's Date	April 2, 2022
Warrant Article #	17
Article Title	EV Charging
Petitioner(s)	Maria Morelli, Senior Planner, Department of Planning and Community Development
Petitioner's email	mmorelli@brooklinema.gov

Not all of these questions apply to all warrant articles. Just answer the ones that do, SAVE the form, ideally with a new file name, and send it back to the chair of the subcommittee charged with vetting your article and to lportscher@brooklinema.gov. Thank you.

	Question	Responses (Enter N/A for "Not Applicable")
1	Provide the most recent version of the article exactly as it is intended to be voted on by Town Meeting. Please highlight any changes from the version that was originally submitted.	(Attach a separate document with the most recent version.) SEE ATTACHED
2	<p>Goals & Benefits (Briefly, or send a separate file):</p> <p>a. What is the intended policy goal of the proposed Warrant Article?</p> <p>b. Why is this important for the Town?</p> <p>c. Is this something that the Town should do, especially if there are State or Federal resources dedicated to the issue?</p> <p>d. How does the policy goal and the proposed action solve a problem? Does it provide a new benefit, or extend some existing benefit?</p> <p>e. Could Town staff or a Town Board or Committee address the issue effectively without action by Town Meeting?</p>	<p>a. To provide scalable, reliable, and accessible EV charging in parking facilities, to implement the Town's sustainability policy especially in regard to zero emissions, and to minimize the costly challenges associated with infrastructure retrofits.</p> <p>1) Single, two-family: One EV ready space per DU</p> <p>2) Three-family, Multifamily: 100% parking EV ready via two main paths: Prescriptive Standard (State Building Code definition) and Performance Minimum Standard (Staff's new definition)</p> <p>3) Non-Residential: Remains 15% of parking spaces (7 or more total)</p> <p>b. See A.</p> <p>c. The State Building Code's inadequate definition and mandate for EV Ready parking infrastructure is not cost effective and does provide design flexibility especially for multifamily residences that are increasingly looking for EV charging for 100% of parking spaces. Staff definition leverages a provision in the State Electrical Code for the least expensive 100% EV Ready solution</p> <p>d. See C</p> <p>e. No.</p>
3	<p>Does the petitioner, now or in the future, have an equity interest or realize a direct or indirect financial benefit from positive action by Town Meeting?</p> <p>If so, what are those interests or benefits?</p> <p>Please disclose any potential conflict of interest.</p>	No

Advisory Committee – Warrant Article Questionnaire
Fall 2021

	Question	Responses (Enter N/A for “Not Applicable”)
4	General questions: a. Why is the proposed solution workable and effective? b. Is there a financial benefit from the proposed solution? c. Who will benefit and who might not benefit from the proposed action? d. What are the perceived pros and cons, both in the short and long term? e. What research on the topic supports or does not support the proposed article? f. What alternatives to the proposed action were considered?	<p>a. Staff’s alternative Performance Standard relies on Automatic Load Management system technology, a provision in the State Electrical that allows up to four EV chargers to be connected to one circuit rated for one EV charger. This 4:1 ratio allows for reasonable overnight charging rates when 100% of parking spaces are occupied by charging EV without requiring an otherwise expensive electrical service of a 1:1 ratio.</p> <p>d. The Attorney General might not approve it, but staff has been discussing issue with DOER, which is considering a similar concept in the 2023 Code update. ALMS technology is not widely implemented</p> <p>e. Solid research is available (see Staff) and has been widely implemented in British Columbia, other major cities in Canada, and parts of California.</p>
5	Consider the impact on town infrastructure (parking, roadways, parks, etc.); residents; the environment; employers; etc. Are there potential adverse effects from positive action on the article by Town Meeting?	<p>f. A proposed warrant article last year but was referred to Planning Department</p> <p>No, it requires a fraction of electrical demand</p>
6	Consider town priorities and allocation of funding. What amount of funding might be required to start and maintain the proposed action? What is the source of those funds? How does the proposed article fit within the operating and/or capital budgets?	NA
7	How does the proposed article and implementation impact the Town administration and staff priorities? Will a department either need to divert staff from an existing program, subcontract the work or add staff?	NA
8	Who will be responsible for implementing the action that a favorable vote will require? Has the petitioner consulted with those participants?	Yes, the Building Commissioner, Deputy Building Commissioner and Chief Electrical Inspector were steadfast partners in devising this Article.
9	Community Outreach: a. What steps has the petitioner taken to assure that interested parties were notified and provided an opportunity to participate in the preparation of the proposed article? b. Are there are Town Boards or Committees that might be consulted? c. If another board or committee has considered the action of the proposed article, please include a summary of the discussion and outcome.	Because Town Meeting voted at Fall 2021 to refer the drafting of this article to Staff, outreach has been diligent, but not widespread. Nonetheless, the whole premise of the Article is to provide the cost effective options for meeting such a mandate with as much design flexibility.
10	Prior Articles: a. Do you know whether Town Meeting previously considered any Warrant Articles that address the same or similar topic? If so, do you know what the	<p>Yes, Fall 2021 ended with referral to Staff. Staff updated petitioners, who are supportive.</p> <p>(Continue on next page)</p>

Advisory Committee – Warrant Article Questionnaire
Fall 2021

	Question	Responses (Enter N/A for “Not Applicable”)
	<p>outcome was?</p> <p>b. How does the proposed article differ from ones that were previously considered?</p> <p>c. Is there new information or are there new circumstances to support raising an issue that was previously considered by Town Meeting?</p>	
11	Anything else you would like the subcommittee to know?	<p>The State is updating the Building Code in 2023 to allow for the ALM provision. In addition, Staff has been meeting with DOER and with a Canadian policy maker to suggest that State revise the EV Ready definition in part by adopting a power transfer minimum predicated on the use of Automatic Load Management system to provide property owners with cost effective options in a 100% EV ready/EVSE ready scenario.</p>